

Note on the exponent puzzle of the Anderson-Mott transition

O. Narikiyo

Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 810-8560, Japan

(Mar. 30, 2007)

Abstract

The exponent puzzle of the Anderson-Mott transition is discussed on the basis of a duality model for strongly correlated electrons.

Keywords: **Anderson-Mott transition, duality model, coherent-incoherent crossover**

The understanding of the Anderson-Mott transition is one of the major challenges in condensed matter physics[1]. Especially an exponent puzzle remains to be resolved.

Recently the experimental determination of the critical exponent around the Anderson-Mott transition has been completed[2]. In the following we try to explain the crossover of the exponent reported in this work[2]. Such an explanation leads to the resolution of the exponent puzzle.

We focus our attention to the case of nominally uncompensated systems[2] in the absence of magnetic field. The effect of the degree of the compensation will be discussed later.

The electrical conductivity at zero temperature $\sigma(0)$ around the metal-

insulator transition behaves as

$$\sigma(0) \propto |N/N_c - 1|^\mu, \quad (1)$$

where N is the doping concentration and N_c is the critical value for the transition.

In the case of nominally uncompensated Ge:Ga samples the exponent μ is experimentally evaluated[2] as $\mu \sim 1$ for $0.99N_c < N < 1.01N_c$ and $\mu \sim 0.5$ otherwise.

To understand this exponent crossover we employ the duality model[3, 4, 5] for strongly correlated electrons. As a function of the energy the density of states for electrons is decomposed into two parts; coherent and incoherent components. The energy range for the coherent component is around the mobility edge E_c . On the other hand, the energy for the incoherent component corresponds to that for the Hubbard band and is apart from E_c . Such a model for strongly correlated electrons are appropriate for uncompensated case.

To discuss the Anderson-Mott transition the effects of electron correlation and randomness should be considered at the same time. The relative importance of these two effects changes according to the degree of compensation. Increasing the degree of compensation the relative importance of randomness increases and that of electron correlation decreases[2].

In the case of nominally uncompensated Ge:Ga samples the region of $\mu \sim 1$ for $0.99N_c < N < 1.01N_c$ corresponds to the situation where the Fermi energy E_F is located at the energy for the coherent component. The exponent $\mu \sim 1$ is expected from the scaling theory[1] for the Anderson transition. Thus the nature of the transition is not correlation-driven Mott-type but randomness-driven Anderson-type and this region is understood as the critical region. On

the other hand, E_F is located at the energy for the incoherent component in the region of $\mu \sim 0.5$. The exponent $\mu \sim 0.5$ results from the scattering with incoherent character[6]. Thus this region is understood as a non-critical one where the incoherent component dominates.

The width of the critical region is controlled by the degree of compensation[2]. In the critical region the effect of randomness dominates over that of correlation. On the other hand, in the non-critical region the correlation dominates over randomness.

The remaining puzzle is the lack of consistency among the exponents[2] in the region of $\mu \sim 0.5$, while in the region of $\mu \sim 1$ the exponents are consistently understood by the scaling theory for the Anderson transition. However, our resolution of the puzzle is rather trivial. In the region of $\mu \sim 0.5$ the incoherent component dominates and the situation is nothing to do with the critical phenomena. Thus, for example, we do not worry about the relation between the conductivity exponent μ and the localization-length exponent ν defined by

$$\xi \propto (1 - N/N_c)^{-\nu}. \quad (2)$$

These two exponents need not to be related in the non-critical region. Moreover, the experimentally observed value[2] of $\nu \sim 1/3$ is easily derived by a simple argument[7].

In summary the metal-insulator transition for doped semiconductors is randomness-driven Anderson-type and the exponents for the outside of the critical region has nothing to do with the critical phenomena.

References

- [1] D. Belitz and T. R. Kirkpatrick: Rev. Mod. Phys. **66** (1994) 261 for a review.
- [2] K. M. Itoh, M. Watanabe, Y. Ootuka, E. E. Haller and T. Ohtsuki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73** (2004) 173.
- [3] K. Miyake and O. Narikiyo: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** (1994) 3821.
- [4] O. Narikiyo and K. Miyake: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** (1994) 4169.
- [5] O. Narikiyo: Physica C **267** (1996) 204.
- [6] T. G. Castner: Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 1539.
- [7] The localization length is identical to the cluster size of the localized magnetic moments. Such clusters are divided by mobile carriers whose motion is incoherent hopping[2] and whose number density is $N_c - N$. Thus the localization length is represented by the mean distance of mobile carriers and proportional to $(N_c - N)^{-1/3}$ in three dimensions. The same argument is employed to understand the incoherent nature of high-temperature superconductors near the Mott transition in Appendix of Ref. [5].